

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

---

## Review of Andrzej Gawroński, Studies About the Buddhist Literature : Collected Papers

Karttunen, Klaus

2016

---

Karttunen , K 2016 , ' Review of Andrzej Gawroński, Studies About the  
Buddhist Literature : Collected Papers ' , Studia Orientalia Electronica , vol. 4  
<https://journal.fi/store/article/view/59489> >

---

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/232332>

---

cc\_by  
publishedVersion

---

*Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.*

*This is an electronic reprint of the original article.*

*This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.*

*Please cite the original version.*

**Andrzej Gawroński** *Studies About the Sanskrit Buddhist Literature: Collected Papers.*  
Ed. Marek Mejer. (Studia Buddhica 2) Warsaw, Research Centre of Buddhist Studies, Faculty  
of Oriental Studies, University of Warsaw, 2012. ISBN 978-83-903229-6-4. 229 pp.

**Reviewed by Klaus Karttunen (University of Helsinki)**

The name Andrzej Gawroński is perhaps no longer as well known among Sanskrit scholars as it deserves to be. Nevertheless, during his relatively short life (1885–1927) he achieved much. Born into a highly cultured Polish family, he completed his PhD and habilitation under Windisch at Leipzig, and, after a brief time at Jagellonian University in Cracow, worked for ten years as Professor of Sanskrit at the then Polish Jan Kazimierz University of Lwów (now Lviv, in Ukraine). Most of his work is now hidden in more or less forgotten publications and is therefore rarely used. His merits pertain to three domains.

The first is the development of Polish Indology. He compiled a handbook of Sanskrit (posthumously published as *Podręcznik sanskrytu: Gramatyka – wypisu – objaśnienia – słownik*, Cracow 1932) which in new editions was still actively used in the 1990s and which, according to my Polish colleagues, is excellent. I remember well an occasion during a visit to Poland when there arose a grammatical question and a young academic asked a colleague, whether she had “her Gawroński” at hand.

The second concerns his important contribution to the history of classical Indian drama, beginning with his dissertation (*Sprachliche Untersuchungen über das Mṛcchakaṭika und das Daśakumāracarita*, 48 pp. Leipzig, 1907) and followed by several other studies. This is the major point of my present criticism – it was a disappointment to see that these have been omitted. It is true that their inclusion would have expanded the volume to twice its present size, but would have been much added to its usefulness.

The third domain, fully covered in the volume, is Buddhist Sanskrit literature, particularly the two poems of Aśvaghoṣa. For Gawroński, this was still a rather fresh topic, as the first edition of the Sanskrit *Buddhacarita* by E.B. Cowell had appeared in 1893, and that of the *Saundarananda* by H.P. Sastri in 1910. E.H. Johnston could already use Gawroński’s studies in his popular editions and translations of both epics. Johnston also wrote a short appreciation of Gawroński’s work for the *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* on the tenth anniversary of Gawroński’s death, which was republished at the beginning of the present volume together with the biographical account of Gawroński by the editor.

The bulk of the volume consists of four studies originally published in 1915–1928. “Gleanings from Aśvaghoṣa’s *Buddhacarita*” surveys the meagre literature at the time and provides a number of critical and exegetical notes on the text. “Studies About the Sanskrit Buddhist Literature” includes additional notes on the text of the *Buddhacarita* and the *Saundarananda*, a comparison

of the *Buddhacarita* with both the *Ayodhyākāṇḍa* of the *Rāmāyaṇa* (also important for the textual history of Vālmīki's epic) and the *Divyāvadāna*, and some notes on the *Jātakamālā*. Two further collections of critical and explanatory notes on the *Saundarananda* then follow.

After almost a century of further research, some of Gawroński's ideas in this volume are certainly antiquated, but the book is still very much worthy of attention.